

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated December 7, 2007, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-24. Claims 11-20 were withdrawn. Claims 1-4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 over *Mao et al* while Claims 2-5 and 21-24 were rejected on other grounds. Applicant has amended the claims, cancelled claims 10 and 21, as well as added new claims 25-29. Applicant requests these remaining claims be allowed.

DRAWINGS

Applicant has amended Figure 4 to add number designations. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, applicant requests the new drawing be accepted.

SPECIFICATION

Applicant has amended the specification to call out "first receiving volume 200" and "second receiving volume 204", which are shown in Figure 4. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, applicant requests the Examiner accept the amendment to the specification.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by *Mao, et al*. Applicant believes the current amendment to claim 1 overcomes the basis for this rejection. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2-4, 10 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Mao et al*. Claim 10 has been cancelled. Claims 2-4 and 24 depend upon Claim 1, which has been amended. As amended, Claim 1 is not fairly taught by *Mao et al*. Specifically, *Mao et al* fails to teach the limitation "wherein said volume is sized larger than said protrusion prior to

insertion of said protrusion into said volume and said securing member attaches said first conductive member to said second conductive member.” Therefore, Claim 1 as well as its dependents, including Claims 2-4 and 24, stand in condition for allowance.

In addition, the Examiner rejected Claims 5-9 and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Titterington et al.* in view of WO 2004/086541. Claim 21 has been cancelled. Currently, Claim 1 and all of its dependents, including Claims 5-9 and 22-24, require the following limitation: “wherein said volume is sized larger than said protrusion prior to insertion of said protrusion into said volume and said securing member attaches said first conductive member to said second conductive member.” This limitation is not taught by the combination of references. Therefore, the rejection to these claims has been overcome.

In addition, Claim 7 requires “a first protrusion and a second protrusion, said first protrusion spaced radially from said second protrusion relative to said axis.” [Claim 7, emphasis added]. This feature is not taught by the combination of references.

Claim 8 requires “said first conductive member and said second conductive member generally comprise a cylinder extending along said axis, wherein one of said protrusion and said volume extends circumferentially about said axis.” Again, this feature is not taught by the combination of references. Claim 8 is thus allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 9 requires “said first volume spaced radially from said second volume.” This feature is not shown by the combination of references. Therefore, Claim 9 is allowable for this additional reason.

As to Claims 22 and 23, the Examiner contends that another volume (protrusion extending transversely from the first volume) is taught by *Titterington et al.* “since portions of the manifold seals would be approximately right angles to the circumferential seal(s).” Applicant

does not understand the basis for this rejection and requests the Examiner identify how the features of Claims 22 and 23 are taught, preferably with reference to a figure in *Titterington et al.*

As to Claim 24, the Examiner contends that WO '541 is inherently capable of accommodating the securing member when it is in a liquid state. However, ridge 24 and groove 30 appear in Figures 3a and 3b of WO '541 to be exactly matched, leaving no room for any adhesive to be accommodated within groove 30. Therefore, Claim 24 is in condition for allowance.

In addition, Applicant has added new claims 25-29, which are allowable over the cited references.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant requests allowance of Claims 1-9 and 22-29.

Applicant hereby petitions to extend the time for filing a response to the Final Office Action mailed March 7, 2008 for one month, the period to end on April 7, 2008.

Applicant believes that fees in the amount of \$120.00 are required for a one month extension of time. The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-0385 in the name of Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation in the amount of \$120.00, as well as for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By: 

Anthony P. Cho, Reg. No. 47,209
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: April 2, 2008

N:\Clients\HAMILTON SUNDSTRAND\IP00072\PATENT\Draft RCE Amendment and Remarks.doc